



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,064	11/17/2003	Anand Pande	15156US01	7036
<div>759006/20/2007 CHRISTOPHER C. WINSLADE MCANDREWS, HELD &amp; MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON ST. 34TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60661</div>			<div>EXAMINER TSAI, SHENG JEN</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2186</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 06/20/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,064

Applicant(s)

PANDE, ANAND

Examiner

Sheng-Jen Tsai

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is taken in response to Applicant's Remarks filed on May 17, 2007 regarding application 10,715,064 filed on November 17, 2003.

2. Claims 1-6 have been cancelled previously.

Claims 7-11 are pending for consideration.

3. ***Response to Remarks***

Applicants' amendments and remarks have been fully and carefully considered, with the Examiner's response set forth below.

Applicant contends that the reference (Kao et al., US 6,263,410) does not teach the limitation of "a comparator for determining whether the FIFO is empty or full based on a comparison of a Gray code associated with the read pointer and a Gray code associated with the write pointer," because in Kao's invention the subtractor receives the output of "Gray Code to Sequential Converter." The Examiner disagrees.

It is noted that figure 1 of Applicant's drawings shows the determination of whether the FIFO [160] is empty is based on a comparison of a read pointer [240] and a write pointer [270], and figure 1 further illustrates that both the read pointer [240] and the write pointer [270] are derived from a respective Gray-to-Binary converter [210 and 150]. Thus, it is clear that in Applicant's invention the comparison is also based on the Gray Code to Binary Converter, and the teaching of Kao is consistent with this limitation.

Therefore, the Examiner's position regarding the merits of patentability of all claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao et al. (US 6,263,410).

As to claim 7, Kao et al. disclose a **circuit for storing data** [figures 1-9 show the details of the circuit], **said circuit comprising:**

**a FIFO for queuing the data** [dual port RAM FIFO, figure 3, 301; Apparatus and Method for Asynchronous Dual Port FIFO (title); An apparatus and method for controlling an asynchronous dual port FIFO memory is provided (abstract)];

**a read pointer for indicating a particular address in the FIFO** [Read Pointer, figure 3, 305 and figure 9, right-hand side];

**a write pointer for indicating another particular address in the FIFO** [Write Pointer, figure 3, 304 and figure 9, left-hand side];

**a first Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the read pointer** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code is a binary code];

**a second Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the write pointer** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer

Art Unit: 2186

(304) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code is a binary code]; and **a comparator for determining whether the FIFO is empty or full based on a comparison of a Gray code associated with the read pointer and a Gray code associated with the write pointer** [figures 3, 7 and 9; It is noted that figure 1 of Applicant's drawings shows the determination of whether the FIFO [160] is empty is based on a comparison of a read pointer [240] and a write pointer [270], and figure 1 further illustrates that both the read pointer [240] and the write pointer [270] are derived from a respective Gray-to-Binary converter [210 and 150]. Thus, it is clear that in Applicant's invention the comparison is also based on the Gray Code to Binary Converter, and the teaching of Kao is consistent with this limitation].

Regarding claim 7, Kao et al. disclose **a first Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the read pointer** [figure 9] in one embodiment and **a second Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the write pointer** [figure 3] in another embodiment, but not in the same embodiment.

However, Kao et al. explicitly point out that the embodiment illustrated in figure 3, which shows **a Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the write pointer**, provides an EMPTY and a ALMOST FULL indicators [see figure 3]. Kao et al. further teach that the ALMOST FULL indicator is only an approximation, and in order to have a precise and accurate FULL indicator the embodiment shown in figure 9 has to be used [column 6, lines 64-67 and column 7,

Art Unit: 2186

lines 1-20]. Thus, in order to have a precise and accurate indicator for both EMPTY and FULL status, both embodiments are needed.

A precise and accurate indicator for both EMPTY and FULL status allows precise and accurate indication of the current usage level of the FIFO device [figure 3, 301] and figure 9], which is critical for preventing overflow and /or underflow of the FIFO [column 1, lines 31-36].

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to recognize that in order to have a precise and accurate indicator for both EMPTY and FULL status, both embodiments illustrated in figures 3 and 9 are needed, which would lead to **a first Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the read pointer [figure 9] and a second Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the write pointer.**

As to claim 8, Kao et al. teach that **a first Gray code generator for generating the Gray code associated with the read pointer** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer (which is Gray coded) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code]; and

**a second Gray code generator for generating the Gray code associated with the write pointer** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer (304, which is Gray coded) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code].

As to claim 9, Kao et al. teach that **a first Gray code to binary converter for generating the particular address indicated by the read pointer** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code]; **and**

**a second Gray code to binary converter for generating the another particular address indicated by the write pointer** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer (304, which is Gray coded) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code];

**wherein the first Gray code to binary converter receives the Gray code associated with the read pointer from the first Gray code generator** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code]; **and**

**wherein the second Gray code to binary converter receives the Gray code associated with the write pointer from the second Gray code generator** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer (304, which is Gray coded) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code].

As to claim 10, Kao et al. teach that **the FIFO comprises a FIFO RAM** [dual port RAM FIFO, figure 3, 301; Apparatus and Method for Asynchronous Dual Port FIFO

Art Unit: 2186

(title); An apparatus and method for controlling an asynchronous dual port FIFO memory is provided (abstract)].

As to claim 11, Kao et al. teach that **a method for storing data** [figures 1-9 show the details of the circuit], **said method comprising:**

**queuing the data in a FIFO** [dual port RAM FIFO, figure 3, 301; Apparatus and Method for Asynchronous Dual Port FIFO (title); An apparatus and method for controlling an asynchronous dual port FIFO memory is provided (abstract)];

**indicating a particular read address in the FIFO** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code];

**indicating a particular write address in the FIFO** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer (304, which is Gray coded) is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code];

**generating the particular read address by converting a first Gray code to binary** [figure 9 shows that the output of the Read Pointer is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code];

**generating the particular write address by converting a second Gray code to binary** [figure 3 shows that the output of the Write Pointer (304, which is Gray coded)

Art Unit: 2186

is fed to a Gray Code to Sequential Converter to generate the address to access the dual port RAM FIFO; note that the sequential code in a binary code]; and **determining whether the FIFO is empty or full based on a comparison of the first Gray code associated and the second Gray code** [figures 2, 3, 7 and 9].

**6. *Related Prior Art Of Record***

The following list of prior art is considered to be pertinent to applicant's invention, but not relied upon for claim analysis conducted above.

- Hsu et al., (US 6,845,414), "Apparatus and Method of Asynchronous FIFO Control."
- Camilleri et al., (US 6,434,642), "FIFO Memory System and Method with Improved Determination of Full and Empty Conditions and Amount of Data Stored."
- Shyi et al., (US 5,426,756), "Memory Controller and Method Determining Empty/Full Status of a FIFO Memory Using Gray Code Counters."
- Brooks et al., (US 5,410,664), "RAM Addressing Apparatus with Lower Power Consumption and Less Noise Generation."
- Cohn et al., (US 4,556,960), "Address Sequencer for Overwrite Avoidance."
- Jiang, (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0207547), "Method of Scalable Gray Coding."
- Pontius, (US 6,337,893), "Non-Power-Of-Two Gray-Code Counter System Having Binary Incrementer with Counts Distributed with Bilateral Symmetry."
- Yi, (US 6,703,950), "Gray Code Sequences."

***Conclusion***

7. Claims 7-11 are rejected as explained above.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheng-Jen Tsai whose telephone number is 571-272-4244. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheng-Jen Tsai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2186

June 14, 2007



MATTHEW KIM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100